

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	Ю.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,045		12/04/2001	Eric Rosen	010561	9631
23696	7590	11/20/2003		EXAMINER	
Qualcon	nm Incorp	oorated	LELE, TANMAY S		
Patents Department 5775 Morehouse Drive			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
San Dieg	San Diego, CA 92121-1714			2684	10
				DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
Advisory Action	10/006,045	ROSEN ET AL.						
,,	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Tanmay S Lele	2684						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 06 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.7 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S136(a) and the appropriate exthe fee. The appropriate exthe final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF								
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);								
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the					
(d) \square they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.					
NOTE: (see attached for response).								
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	OT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-60</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)								
10. Other:								
		Tanmay Lele Tele: (703) 305-34	62					

Ŷ

Application/Control Number: 10/006,045

Art Unit: 2684

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed 06 November 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2. In response to applicant's argument that "there is no mention of using Internet or IP datagram in Maher...", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Regarding claims 1- 60, Applicant attempts to overcome the rejection by stating, "There is no mention of using Internet of IP data gram in Maher, neither in [the cited].... or anywhere else." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Note that by definition (for example, from Newton's Telecom Dictionary" 10th Edition), a datagram is "a finite length packet with sufficient information to be independently routed from source to destination." As cited in the pervious Office Action (paper number 8, page 7) Maher indeed makes reference to the above, as the systems described by Maher pertains to an IP multicast communication system, where payloads are sent between terminals based on address (column 4, lines 25 –40). Note further that the Maher's system addresses routing where a controller assigns and manages payload and controls IP multicast addresses for payload and control messages (column 6,1 lines 36 – 46). Such references are respectfully believed to be exemplified throughout Maher (another example seen

Application/Control Number: 10/006,045

Art Unit: 2684

in column 6, beginning line 62). Therefore, Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's argument

Page 3

that the references when combined for the cited motivation, do not teach or recite the claimed as

currently presented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanmay S Lele whose telephone number is (703) 305-3462. The

examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 6:30 PM Monday – Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (703) 308-7745. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

2

Tanmay S Lele Examiner

Art Unit 2684

NAY MAUNG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

tsl

November 18, 2003